DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 011 HE 003 309

AUTHOR	Furniss, W. Todd
TITLE	Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: Current Practice.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	27 Jul 72
NOTE	6p.; A.C.E. Special Report
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Contracts; Contract Salaries; *Higher Education; *Probationary Period; Professors; Teacher Employment; Teacher Welfare; *Tenure

ABSTRACT

From a survey designed to determine the current practices involved in faculty tenure and contract systems at colleges and universities throughout the U.S., it is estimated that 94.7% of faculty members work in institutions that have tenure systems. It is further determined that personnel practices in most institutions with tenure systems are characterized by: (1) at least an initial period of short contracts; (2) a high rate of the award of tenure after the final review; (3) no limitations on the percentage of tenured faculty; and (4) maximum probationary period ranging from 3 to 7 years, which may be reduced by credit for prior service in about two-thirds of the universities and private 4-year colleges. Personnel practices in most institutions with contract systems only are characterized by: (1) a high rate of contract renewal; and (2) provision of written reasons for nonrenewal of contracts. (HS)

ED 067011

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A.C.E. Special Report

American Council on Education • One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

July 27, 1972

Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: Current Practice

W. TODD FURNISS
Director, Commission on Academic Affairs
American Council on Education

A ten-item survey of current faculty tenure and contract practices was conducted in April 1972 by the Higher Education Panel (a survey mechanism of the American Council on Education) at the request of the Commission on Academic Tenure, which is co-sponsored by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges.[1] The Commission's final report, to be published in fall 1972, will incorporate the data presented here and analyze it fully. Because of the interest of the members of the American Council on Education in timely information about faculty personnel matters, the Council's Commission on Academic Affairs and the Higher Education Panel recommended early publication of the data tables and highlights of the survey. The brief interpretative notes are the sole responsibility of the author.

Nature of the Survey

The survey questionnaire was mailed to 511 institutions of the Higher Education Panel, a sample of 20 percent of the national population of 2,543 institutions. Responses were received from 413 institutions, a response of 81 percent. (The actual return was 86 percent; however, because of the fast turnaround required, data analysis began when the return rate reached 81 percent.)

Each respondent was asked to indicate whether his institution used a tenure or a term appointment (contract) system; he was then requested to answer a variety of questions concerning the characteristics and operation of the existing system. Information on the sampling and weighting procedures and a copy of the questionnaire may be found in the Appendixes A and B.

[1] The survey was conducted by Barbara A. Blandford with the technical assistance of John A. Creager, David E. Drew, Jeffrey E. Dutton, Laura Kent, and Joan Tucker of the American Council on Education's Office of Research. Consultant for the Commission on Academic Tenure was John Ferguson.

Reading the Item Tables

The item tables (see pages 3-4) present the data collected, *expressed as percentages*, and are keyed numerically to the numbered items on the questionnaire:[2]

Item 1:	Proportions of institutions with tenure systems, by type and total population.
Items 2-6:	Responses of institutions with *tenure* systems.
Items 7a-7c:	Responses of institutions with *contract* systems.
Items 8-9:	Responses of all institutions—both tenure and contract systems.

Highlights of the Survey

Extent of Tenure Systems (Item 1)

Tenure systems are nearly universal in both public and private universities and four-year colleges and are found in more than two-thirds of the two-year institutions. These figures, in combination with data supplied by the USOE *Digest of Educational Statistics* (1970) and the ACE Office of Research, indicate that an estimated 94.7 percent of faculty members in this country work in institutions that have tenure systems.

The Characteristics of Tenure Systems

Nationally, the median maximum length of the probationary period in tenure systems is six years, higher in the private universities (seven years), and lower in the two-year public and

[2] The questionnaire also contained an item on collective bargaining: "Is there a recognized faculty bargaining agent on your campus?" Data on responses to this item are omitted because, after correction of errors caused by misinterpretations of the question, the weighted percentages of all institutions answering "yes" were too small to be used as planned; i.e., in cross-tabulations with other responses to the questionnaire. The Commission on Academic Tenure will seek useful data on this subject by other means.

HE 003 307

private colleges (four and five years, respectively) (Item 2a). The probationary period may be reduced by credit for prior service at other educational institutions in 45 percent of all institutions (Item 2b), most commonly in universities and private four-year colleges. Wherever prior service credit is granted, the maximum allowable is usually three years.

Initial contracts in almost all two- and four-year colleges with tenure systems are for one year, as are succeeding contracts. Initial contracts of one year prevail in two-thirds of the public and private universities. One-third of the universities reported that initial or succeeding contracts or both were for two or three years (Item 2c).

Items 3a and 3b indicate that virtually all universities and four-year colleges, but only half of the two-year colleges, use conventional faculty ranks and award tenure to professors and associate professors. Though all types of institutions may award tenure to assistant professors, this is done least often in private universities (58 percent). In only one-third of all institutions may instructors receive tenure.

Very few institutions (ranging from none of the public two-year colleges to about one in ten of the private four-year colleges) limit the proportion of tenured faculty (Item 5). At the time of the survey 41-50 percent of the faculty were tenured at the median institution; the proportion was higher for universities and public two-year colleges and lower for private two-year colleges (Item 4). More than two-fifths of all institutions reported that their tenure systems are currently under review for possible changes (Item 6).

The Operation of Tenure Systems

Of those institutions with tenure systems in the spring of 1971, 42 percent reported granting tenure to *all* faculty members under consideration for tenure. Nearly three-quarters awarded tenure to 61 percent or more of the faculty considered (Item 2d). These figures obtain even though about one-fourth of the universities failed to respond to this item. (If they had responded, the rate of award of tenure might be higher but would not be lower.)

In cases where a probationary-period contract is not renewed or where tenure is denied, close to half of all institutions always give written reasons to the faculty member, and 16 percent never give written reasons for the action (Item 8).

Procedures for appealing adverse decisions are available in 87 percent of all colleges and universities (Item 9). In the thirty months preceding the survey, faculty members had availed themselves of these procedures in three-quarters of the universities, two-thirds of the private four-year colleges, nearly half of the public four-year colleges, slightly fewer of the public two-year colleges, and less than a fifth of the private two-year colleges (Item 9a). In only about 14 percent of all institutions with tenure systems had more than three appeals been made during the period; universities and public four-year colleges tended to have higher incidences than did the other three institutional types.

Again using USOE and ACE data on faculty numbers in the various types of institutions, one can calculate roughly that there were three or fewer appeals for every thousand faculty members in universities, about eight per thousand for private four- and two-year colleges, and thirteen or more per thousand for public four- and two-year colleges.

The Characteristics and Operations of Contract Systems

Slightly under one-third of the two-year colleges, both public and private, and about 6 percent of the private four-year colleges reported having contract systems. Initial and succeeding contracts of one year are universal, except in 29 percent of the private four-year colleges, which offer two- or three-year succeeding contracts (Item 7a). Virtually all institutions give written reasons for nonrenewal "always" or "sometimes," but only 19 percent have procedures for appeal (Items 8 and 9), and these procedures tend to be used infrequently: In the thirty months prior to the survey, they were used only once in most cases and never more than three times (Item 9a).

In the spring of 1971, four out of five contracts were renewed in more than 95 percent of the institutions, and all contracts were renewed in 22 percent (Item 7b). Few of the two-year institutions that have contract systems are considering a shift to a tenure system, but more than a quarter of the private four-year colleges are planning to switch (Item 7c).

Interpretation

More comprehensive questionnaires are necessary to confirm what is suggested by the ten-item HEP instrument. Nevertheless, the survey points to the following tentative conclusions.

Personnel practices in most institutions with tenure systems are characterized by

- at least an initial period of short contracts (one to three years)
- a high rate of the award of tenure after the final review
- no limitations on the percentage of tenured faculty
- maximum probationary period ranging from three to seven years, which may be reduced by credit for prior service in about two-thirds of the universities and private four-year colleges—the institutions where the probationary period is likely to be the longest[3]

Personnel practices in most institutions with contract systems only are characterized by

- a high rate of contract renewal
- provision of written reasons for nonrenewal of contracts

The most noteworthy point about these highlights of the data lies in the contrast between what is now being done and what may have to be done. It may be that, in the past, the policies and practices of large numbers of institutions were inadequate or repressive. This survey indicates, however, that AAUP policies with respect to length of probationary period, credit for prior service, written reasons for nonrenewal, and the availability of appeal procedures are widely observed and that the operation of these policies has assured continued employment, as indicated by the rates of contract renewal and award of tenure.

What may well give us pause is the set of conditions that are now stimulating so many institutions to reexamine their tenure policies (Item 6). Declining rates of enrollment growth, stable or reduced staffs, dwindling financial resources, and a surplus of faculty in some fields are among the factors that have forced institutions to consider what steps should be taken to prevent deficits in funds and to provide a healthy mix of faculty capable

[3]The questionnaire did not ask how frequently the maximum probationary period was shortened by promotion, administrative action, or other means common on many campuses.

of fulfilling their mission not only as it is defined today but also as it will be defined in the future. To what extent each of the policies and practices considered in this survey contributes to the problems that institutions may legitimately wish to avoid is still not clear. The survey seems to say that equitable personnel policies generously applied have been the order of the day. What it asks is, "Can they be continued?"

TABLE 1

RESPONSES OF INSTITUTIONS WITH *TENURE* SYSTEMS, STATED IN PERCENTAGES

ITEM	UNIVERSITIES		COLLEGES				ALL INSTITUTIONS
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC 4 YEAR	PRIVATE 4 YEAR	PUBLIC 2 YEAR	PRIVATE 2 YEAR	
ITEM 1: A full-time faculty member may be granted tenure at this institution							
Yes	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.1	68.3	68.2	84.9
ITEM 2a: Maximum length of the probationary period in institutions with a tenure system							
1 year	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.5	4.4	0.0	1.6
2 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.0	0.0	1.2
3 years	7.8	6.5	3.9	6.2	39.4	22.2	15.4
4 years	7.8	0.0	12.1	4.5	17.5	10.8	9.5
5 years	28.9	9.7	24.4	18.1	15.1	20.4	19.0
6 years	11.7	16.1	28.7	20.7	0.0	14.4	15.7
7 years	36.7	64.5	27.5	47.5	17.5	32.3	35.5
8 years	7.0	3.2	1.4	1.5	2.0	0.0	1.9
9 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2
ITEM 2b: Maximum years of prior service accepted as part of the probationary period							
None	32.8	37.9	69.4	40.8	69.7	73.7	54.7
1 year	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.3	2.4	2.4	1.5
2 years	5.6	0.0	7.0	6.5	6.4	0.0	5.8
3 years	40.8	48.3	9.8	35.5	17.2	10.8	25.5
4 years	13.6	3.4	2.2	11.1	4.4	10.8	7.9
5 or more years	7.2	10.3	7.8	5.8	0.0	2.4	4.6
ITEM 2c: Typical length of contracts awarded a faculty member during the probationary period							
First contract							
1 year	66.4	64.5	93.5	90.5	98.0	100.0	91.5
2 years	18.0	3.2	5.1	6.2	0.0	0.0	4.6
3 years	15.6	32.3	1.4	3.1	2.0	0.0	3.7
4 or more years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1

TABLE 1 (Continued)

ITEM	UNIVERSITIES		COLLEGES				ALL INSTITUTIONS
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC 4 YEAR	PRIVATE 4 YEAR	PUBLIC 2 YEAR	PRIVATE 2 YEAR	
ITEM 2c (*Continued*)							
Succeeding contracts							
1 year	64.0	61.3	94.9	84.0	96.0	91.6	87.5
2 years	18.0	3.2	0.0	9.2	2.0	0.0	5.5
3 years	12.5	35.5	5.1	5.7	0.0	8.4	5.6
4 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1
5 years	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.8
6 or more years	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
ITEM 2d: What percent of those faculty members considered for tenure in the spring of 1971 actually received tenure?							
0	0.0	0.0	9.3	12.5	2.4	16.8	8.7
1-20	4.6	6.4	3.7	3.8	0.0	3.0	2.9
21-40	0.0	6.4	2.0	2.8	0.0	2.4	1.9
41-60	5.5	6.5	3.6	9.2	6.8	2.4	6.9
61-80	15.7	22.6	17.9	18.3	13.5	10.8	16.4
81-99	29.7	25.8	25.8	5.0	18.8	2.4	13.5
100	14.8	9.7	32.3	41.0	54.2	62.3	42.1
No response	29.7	22.6	5.3	7.5	4.4	0.0	7.5
ITEM 3a: Is your faculty ranked or unranked?							
Ranked	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.4	47.8	50.9	81.4
Unranked	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	52.2	49.1	18.6
ITEM 3b: If your faculty is ranked, in what ranks may tenure be held?							
Professor	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Assoc. Prof.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Asst. Prof.	69.5	58.1	89.8	83.7	100.0	78.8	85.2
Instructor	43.0	19.4	41.8	22.7	50.0	52.9	33.3
Other	7.8	0.0	12.2	1.0	22.5	0.0	6.8
ITEM 4: Percent of current full-time faculty with tenure							
0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.0	8.4	1.4
1-20	0.0	0.0	3.3	8.3	15.1	3.0	8.1
21-30	4.7	3.2	13.3	8.7	17.9	19.2	12.1
31-40	13.3	0.0	17.2	14.6	6.8	29.9	13.7
41-50	28.9	32.3	23.0	28.1	2.0	13.8	19.9
51-60	25.0	38.7	16.1	17.2	21.5	7.8	18.4
61-70	15.6	19.4	23.3	12.6	6.4	2.4	12.4
71-80	5.5	0.0	1.9	4.3	13.1	13.2	6.7
81-90	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.0	11.1	2.4	4.5
91-100	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	1.1
No response	4.7	3.2	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.6

TABLE 1 (Continued)

ITEM	UNIVERSITIES: PUBLIC	UNIVERSITIES: PRIVATE	COLLEGES: PUBLIC 1-YEAR	COLLEGES: PRIVATE 1-YEAR	COLLEGES: PUBLIC 2-YEAR	COLLEGES: PRIVATE 2-YEAR	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 5: Does your institution limit the percent of tenured faculty?							
Yes	5.5	6.5	7.5	9.5	0.0	2.4	5.9
No	94.5	93.5	92.5	90.5	100.0	97.6	94.1
ITEM 6: Is the tenure system currently under review for change on your campus?							
Yes	48.4	41.9	36.6	54.1	28.6	40.1	43.2
No	51.6	58.1	63.4	45.9	71.4	59.9	56.8

TABLE 2

RESPONSES OF INSTITUTIONS* WITH *CONTRACT* SYSTEMS STATED IN PERCENTAGES

ITEM	PRIVATE 4-YEAR COLLEGES	PUBLIC 2-YEAR COLLEGES	PRIVATE 2-YEAR COLLEGES	TOTAL
ITEM 7a: What has been the typical length of contracts?				
First contract				
1 year	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Succeeding contracts				
1 year	71.2	100.0	100.0	95.7
2 years	8.5	0.0	0.0	1.3
3 years	20.3	0.0	0.0	3.1
ITEM 7b: What percentage of those faculty whose contracts expired in 1971 were renewed?				
0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21-40	0.0	0.0	5.1	1.0
41-60	0.0	0.0	17.9	3.6
61-80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
81-90	8.5	9.4	6.4	8.7
91-99	25.4	83.5	34.6	65.0
100	66.1	7.1	35.9	21.7
ITEM 7c: Is your institution planning to establish a tenure system?				
Yes	28.8	14.6	0.0	13.8
No	71.2	85.4	100.0	86.2

*Note that no universities or public four-year colleges appear in this group.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

ITEM	UNIVERSITIES: PUBLIC	UNIVERSITIES: PRIVATE	COLLEGES: PUBLIC 1-YEAR	COLLEGES: PRIVATE 1-YEAR	COLLEGES: PUBLIC 2-YEAR	COLLEGES: PRIVATE 2-YEAR	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 8: Does your institution give written reasons to the faculty member concerned for nonrenewal of contracts (probationary or recurring term appointments) or for denial of tenure?							
All institutions							
Never	13.3	19.4	26.9	14.5	14.0	0.0	14.7
Sometimes	50.8	61.3	34.9	46.9	18.0	58.8	38.0
Always	35.9	19.4	38.2	38.5	68.1	41.2	47.3
Institutions with tenure systems							
Never	13.3	19.4	26.9	14.9	17.5	0.0	16.4
Sometimes	50.8	61.3	34.9	49.9	19.5	53.3	40.5
Always	35.9	19.4	38.2	35.2	63.0	46.7	43.1
Institutions with contract systems							
Never	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	8.5	6.3	0.0	5.4
Sometimes	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0.0	14.6	70.5	23.5
Always	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	91.5	79.1	29.5	71.1
ITEM 9: Does your institution have procedures under which a faculty member whose contract was not renewed or who was denied tenure may appeal?							
All institutions							
Yes	86.7	83.9	91.4	81.1	93.1	77.6	86.3
Institutions with tenure systems							
Yes	86.7	83.9	91.4	80.7	93.2	95.2	87.1
Institutions with contract systems							
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	13.6	7.1	60.3	18.7
ITEM 9a: How often have any of these procedures been used since September, 1969?							
All institutions							
0	26.1	23.1	33.3	52.7	63.5	82.1	53.9
1	18.0	23.1	20.0	24.6	9.6	6.3	17.0
2-3	26.1	19.2	20.3	17.4	19.0	4.2	17.8
4-10	27.0	19.1	16.3	4.7	6.4	7.4	8.6
11+	0.0	11.5	10.0	0.6	1.5	0.0	2.4
No response	2.7	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Institutions with tenure systems							
0	26.1	23.1	33.3	52.7	56.4	81.1	50.4
1	18.0	23.1	20.0	23.1	6.8	5.0	16.4
2-3	26.1	19.2	20.3	19.5	25.3	5.0	19.9
4-10	27.0	19.1	16.3	5.0	9.4	8.8	10.1
11+	0.0	11.5	10.0	0.7	2.2	0.0	2.8
No response	2.7	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Institutions with contract systems							
0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	52.9	78.8	87.1	75.5
1	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	47.1	15.7	12.9	20.4
2-3	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0.0	5.5	0.0	4.1

APPENDIX A

Sampling and Weighting Procedures

The sampling and reporting unit for this survey was the institution. The relevant population of institutions consisted of the 2,543 colleges and universities that responded to the Office of Education's Higher Education General Information Survey of 1970 (HEGIS-V), except for those requiring undergraduate credits for admission to their first class (for example, some professional schools) and a few very small institutions. This population was stratified into 36 cells as indicated in Table A1. Response frequencies from each institution were weighted by the appropriate *cell weight:* the ratio of the number of institutions in the population to the number of institutions in the sample for the given cell.

These stratification cells are grouped into seven major reporting categories: public universities, private universities, public four-year colleges, private four-year colleges, public two-year colleges, private two-year colleges, and all institutions. The finer stratification within these reporting categories permits more exact control for size and, in the case of the four-year private colleges, for control (nonsectarian, Catholic, other sectarian). It was impossible to apply differential weights for tenured and nontenured subgroups because their distribution in the population of institutions was unknown. In fact, one of the major products of this survey is an estimate of this distribution.

Table A1: Sample and Weights Used in Computing National Population Estimates

CELL NUMBER	STRATIFICATION DESIGN FOR SAMPLING	NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS IN: POPULATION	SAMPLE	CELL WEIGHTS
	Public universities			
	Selectivity:			
1	Less than 550	72	11	6.6
2	550-599	31	11	2.8
3	600 or more	16	6	2.7
	Private universities			
	Selectivity:			
4	Less than 550	18	8	2.3
5	550-599	14	7	2.0
6	600 or more	35	16	2.2
	Four-year public colleges			
	Selectivity:			
7	Less than 450	97	13	7.5
8	450-499	66	8	8.3
9	500 or more	73	16	4.6
10	Unknown	88	7	12.6
	Four-year private nonsectarian colleges			
	Selectivity:			
11, 15	Less than 500; unknown	231	20	11.6
12	500-574	38	6	6.3
13	575-649	50	26	1.9
14	650 or more	45	28	1.6
	Four-year Catholic colleges			
	Selectivity:			
16	Less than 500	62	18	3.4
17	500-574	72	15	4.8
18	575 or more	39	9	4.3
19	Unknown	45	5	9.0
	Four-year other sectarian colleges			
	Selectivity:			
20	Less than 450	56	10	5.6
21	450-499	54	11	4.9
22	500-574	73	26	2.8
23	575 or more	54	34	1.6
24	Unknown	95	8	11.9
	Two-year public colleges			
	Enrollment:			
25-27	Less than 500	408	17	24.0
28	500-999	209	16	13.1
29	1,000 or more	169	16	10.6
	Two-year private colleges			
	Enrollment:			
30, 31	Less than 250	163	12	13.6
32	250-499	50	13	3.8
33	500 or more	19	4	4.8
	Predominantly black colleges			
34	Public four-year	36	5	7.2
35	Private four-year	49	8	6.1
36	Two-year	16	3	5.3

APPENDIX B: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Higher Education Panel
Survey Number 8

ACADEMIC TENURE

In many of the questions below the phrase "full-time faculty" is used. This should be interpreted as referring to current full-time faculty members and other full-time staff members who hold faculty appointments (e.g., administrators). Specifically excluded from this definition are graduate students who act as teaching assistants or teaching fellows.

1. A full-time faculty member may be granted tenure at this institution: [If "no," skip to question No. 7] Yes____ No____

2. This institution has a probationary period for tenure: [If "no," skip to question No. 3] Yes____ No____

   a. Maximum length of probationary period: _____years

   b. Maximum years of prior service accepted as part of the probationary period:_____years [No prior service accepted_____]

   c. Typical length of contracts awarded a faculty member during the probationary period: First contract _____years
   Succeeding contracts _____years

   d. What percent of those faculty members considered for tenure in the spring of 1971 actually received tenure? _____percent

APPENDIX B: (Continued)

3. In what ranks may tenure be held? [Check as many as apply]
Professor____ Associate____ Assistant____ Instructor____
Other____ [Specify _____]
If your faculty is unranked, check here _____

Percent of current full-time faculty with tenure: _____percent

5. Does your institution limit the percent of tenured faculty? Yes____ No____

6. Is the tenure system currently under review for change on your campus? Yes____ No____

7. FOR THOSE INSTITUTIONS WITH *ONLY* TERM APPOINTMENT (CONTRACT) SYSTEMS
[Other institutions skip to question No. 8]:

a. What has been the typical length of contracts:
First contract _____years Succeeding contracts _____years

b. What percentage of those faculty whose contracts expired in 1971 were renewed? _____percent

c. Is your institution planning to establish a tenure system? [Continue to No. 8] Yes____ No____

8. Does your institution give formal written reasons to the faculty member concerned for nonrenewal of contracts (probationary or recurring term appointments) or for denial of tenure?
Always _____ Sometimes _____ Never_____

9. Does *your institution* have procedures under which a faculty member whose contract was not renewed or who was denied tenure may appeal? Yes____ No____

a. If yes, how often have any of these procedures been used since September, 1969? _____times

10. Is there a recognized faculty bargaining agent on your campus? Yes____ No____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM BY APRIL 17. 4/5/72

AN A.C.E. SPECIAL REPORT

The material in this report is not copyrighted, and may be quoted and reproduced in the interest of education. Additional copies are not available for distribution.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036